



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,323	12/13/2001	Randal D. Schafer	840070.404	2929

7590 11/29/2002  
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC  
701 FIFTH AVE  
SUITE 6300  
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

GONZALEZ, MADELINE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2859

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/015,323

Applicant(s)

SCHAFFER, RANDAL D.

Examiner

Madeline Gonzalez

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The description stated on page 15, lines 4-11, appears to be directed to Fig. 12, and not to Fig. 11.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Drawings*

2. Figures 1 and 3-10 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference number 120, as stated on page 15, line 15, and reference number 122, as stated on page 15, line 16. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 11, 13 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- a) Claims 1 and 11 recite the limitation “the working material” in lines 7 and 10, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
  - b) Claim 13 recites the limitation “the sheet of material” in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
  - c) Claim 17: “(??)” in line 2 should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13: The claim includes the limitation “the sheet of material” in line 1. This limitation is confusing because it is not clear to what sheet of material, the rigid or the flexible, is applicant referring to.

Claim 17: The claim language is confusing because it is not clear what is applicant intending to claim with the limitation "the sheet of rigid material is placed against the side of the sheet of rigid material". It appears that the limitation should read -- the sheet of flexible material is placed against the side of the sheet of rigid material--.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-6, 11-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pederson (U.S. 3,171,888) in view of Szabo (U.S. 2,522,908).

Pederson discloses a ruler, as shown in Fig. 1, having:

- a sheet of rigid material having a plurality of lines *B* formed on a first side thereof;
- and
- a roughened surface *C* on a second side to provide a non-slip surface when placed against a surface.

Pederson lacks a flexible sheet, the specific material of the rigid and the flexible sheets, the specific location of the flexible sheet, the specific means by which the flexible sheet is adhered to the rigid sheet, the flexible sheet being removably adhered to the rigid sheet, the flexible sheet having a plurality of segments, and the specific location of the lines.

With respect to the flexible sheet: Szabo discloses a ruler having a sheet of rigid material 12 and including a plurality of lines 15 formed on a first side, and a sheet of flexible and non-slipping material 17 on a second side to prevent the ruler from sliding on the work. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the ruler disclosed by Pederson with a sheet of flexible and non-slipping material as taught by Szabo, instead of the roughened surface, since they are alternate types of surfaces which will perform the same function, if one is replaced with the other, of preventing the ruler from sliding on the work.

With respect to the specific material of the rigid and the flexible sheets: Pederson as modified by Szabo disclosed a ruler having a sheet of rigid material on a first side and a sheet of flexible material on a second side. The particular type of material used to make the rigid sheet and the flexible sheet claimed by applicant, i.e., transparent sheet of rigid material; and transparent sheet of non-static cling, flexible material, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the use of a " preferred " or " optimum " material out of a plurality of well known materials that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have find obvious to provide using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the intended use

of Applicant's apparatus, i.e., suitability for the intended use of Applicant's apparatus. See In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960) where the court stated that a selection of a material on the basis of suitability for intended use of an apparatus would be entirely obvious.

With respect to the specific location of the flexible sheet, and the specific location of the lines: Pederson as modified by Szabo disclosed a ruler having a sheet of rigid material having a plurality of lines formed on a first side, and a sheet of flexible material covering the entire of a second side. Changing the location of the flexible sheet from the location shown by Pederson as modified by Szabo to a location on first side of the ruler, and changing the location of the lines from the location shown by Pederson as modified by Szabo to a location on a second side of the sheet of rigid material; or to a location on the second side of the flexible material, absent any criticality, is only considered to be an obvious modification of the ruler disclosed by Pederson as modified by Szabo that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be able to provide using routine experimentation since the courts have held that there is no invention in shifting the position if the operation of the device would not be thereby modified. See In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

With respect to the specific means by which the flexible sheet is adhered to the rigid sheet: Pederson as modified by Szabo disclosed a ruler having a flexible sheet adhered to a rigid sheet. The specific means by which the flexible sheet is adhered to the rigid sheet claimed by applicant, i.e., with surface adhesion, absent any criticality, is considered to be nothing more than a choice of engineering skill, choice or design because 1) neither non-obvious nor unexpected

Art Unit: 2859

results, i.e., results which are different in kind and not in degree from the results of the prior art, will be obtained as long as the flexible sheet is adhered to the rigid sheet, as already suggested by Pederson as modified by Szabo, and 2) the use of the particular type of adhesion means by Applicant is considered to be nothing more than the use of one of numerous and well known alternate types of adhesion means that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to provide using routine experimentation in order to adhere the flexible sheet to the rigid sheet as already suggested by Pederson as modified by Szabo.

With respect to the flexible sheet being removably adhered to the rigid sheet: Pederson as modified by Szabo disclosed a ruler including a sheet of rigid material and a sheet of flexible material being adhered to the sheet of rigid material. The term “removably” does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention from Pederson as modified by Szabo. Furthermore, in a broad sense, any structure may be considered to be “removably”, if so desired as long as the structure may be removed by any means, if so desired.

With respect to the flexible sheet having a plurality of segments: Pederson as modified by Szabo disclosed a ruler having a sheet of rigid material including a plurality of lines formed on a first side and a sheet of flexible material formed on a second side. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide lines on the sheet of flexible material in order to make more accurate measurements and avoid any visual distortion that may result from the addition of the sheet of flexible material, since it has been



held that the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. See St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

9. Claims 7-10, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCutchen et al. (U.S. 5,105,551) [hereinafter McCutchen].

McCutchen discloses a tool, as shown in Fig. 1, having:

- a sheet of rigid material 16 having opposing first and second sides with a plurality of lines formed on one of the first and second sides;
- a sheet of flexible material 10 having opposing first and second sides with a plurality of lines formed on one of the first and second sides, said sheet of flexible material 10 is adhered to only one of the first and second sides of the sheet of rigid material 16 and sized and shaped to substantially cover the side to which it is adhered and to provide a non-slip surface when placed against a surface;
- wherein the sheet of flexible material 10 is placed against the side of the sheet of rigid material 16 on which the plurality of lines are formed;
- wherein the sheet of flexible material 10 can be formed of multiple segments 60, 61, as shown in Fig. 4.

McCutchen lacks the specific material of the rigid and of the flexible sheets, the flexible sheet being removably adhered to the rigid sheet, and the method steps.

With respect to the specific material of the rigid and of the flexible sheets: McCutchen discloses a tool including a sheet of rigid material 16 and a sheet of flexible material 10 being adhered to the sheet of rigid material 16. The particular type of material used to make the rigid sheet and the flexible sheet claimed by applicant, i.e., transparent sheet of rigid material; and transparent sheet of non-static cling, flexible material, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the use of a “ preferred ” or “ optimum ” material out of a plurality of well known materials that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have find obvious to provide using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the intended use of Applicant’s apparatus, i.e., suitability for the intended use of Applicant’s apparatus. See In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960) where the court stated that a selection of a material on the basis of suitability for intended use of an apparatus would be entirely obvious.

With respect to the flexible sheet being removably adhered to the rigid sheet: McCutchen discloses a tool including a sheet of rigid material 16 and a sheet of flexible material 10 being adhered to the sheet of rigid material 16. The term “removably” does not structurally distinguish the claimed invention from McCutchen. Furthermore, in a broad sense, any structure may be considered to be “ removably ”, if so desired as long as the structure may be removed by any means, if so desired.

With respect to the method steps: The method steps are met during the normal fabrication of the tool stated above.

*Conclusion*

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Schafer discloses an apparatus for clamping a template to a workpiece. Brady discloses a non-slip sewing ruler. McEligot discloses a method for making a cutting guide. Carder, Abell, Hahn, Lucas and Weston disclose instruments having non-slip inserts. Jewell discloses an antislipping and cushion device. Rank discloses a see-thru instrument. Anderson discloses a tool for measuring, marking a cutting fabric materials. Arnold discloses an alignment device having a non-slip surface.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Madeline Gonzalez whose telephone number is (703) 308-7004. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:30), alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F.F. Gutierrez can be reached on (703) 308-3875. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7724 for regular communications and (703) 305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

MG  
November 26, 2002



Diego F.F. Gutierrez  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800